All worlds up to that of Brahman are subject to rebirth again and again.
—*The Bhagavad-Gita*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 51 JANUARY, 1963 NUMBER 3

THE POWER OF HIGH RESOLVE

FROM time immemorial—ever since the battle between higher and lower Manas began to rage—human beings have felt the urge to make New Year's resolutions. And from a period equally remote, the causes for failure to keep them have also been present. The *urge* itself is pure, uplifting and divine, for it springs from the Higher Self, which is the source and inspirer of all of man's nobler deeds. But the intelligence with which our resolutions are formulated, the aims and objectives toward which they are directed, as well as the *deus ex machina* by which fulfillment is sought—all have their fount and origin in the wisdom or unwisdom of the lower personal self. The impulse to make resolutions springs from higher Manas, while the causes for failure to keep them resides in the lower.

The New Year's cycle, or "the birth of the Sun," as it was called by ancient philosophers, has ever been the season of both retrospect and prospect, when peoples of all nations and times have looked back over the closing year for purposes of evaluation, and for determining, if they could, the measure of merit won; when they cast a searching eye into the future for signs of promise, courage and hope. But from the emphasis placed by Western nations upon business, social and personal gain, the event of New Year's, nowadays, is usually given its lowest possible meaning and importance. For the man of business, the observance often involves a consideration only of stocks and inventories, losses and gains. The socialite thinks mostly in terms of prominence, and is likely to weigh the number of invitations received during the season's social calendar against those events and activities at which his presence was not requested. For many individuals, New Year's Day is just another holiday, a period of respite from work and duty, which one either uses or mis-

uses as an opportunity for rest and relaxation. The highest concept to which Western thought seems able to soar with respect to the occasion is that it has something to do with the earth and sun, and marks the end of one cycle of the earth's journey through space and the beginning of another. Yet none could possibly live without the warming rays of the heavenly Life-Giver.

In its simplest and most understandable terms, New Year's Day is one phase or aspect of the universal law of cycles. The three hundred sixty-five day period required by the earth to complete its journey around the sun constitutes one year, as every fair-sized child in school is well aware. The twenty-eight day period of the moon, with its four quarters, is another astronomical cycle, well known to farmers and widely observed in the processes of planting, growth and harvest. The cycle of the seasons—spring, summer, fall and winter, followed by spring—governs not only the expression of all *things* upon earth, but also much of the social and business life of human beings as well. Then there are cycles within the constitution of man himself—the heartbeat, breathing, waking and sleeping, and eating, for example—all manifestations in small of the never-ceasing law of periodicity. These are but a few of the obvious manifestations of the universal law of cycles. But behind and within the veil of matter, beneath the level of sense perception, lies the Occult Cosmos, with its ebb and flow of invisible force and power. What men see, hear, feel, taste, or smell, is only a fragment—the outer dress or garment—of the real universe within. It was with these invisible occult potencies that ancient nations were primarily concerned, and it is of these that Theosophists of both past and present eras are especially solicitous in their observances of the New Year.

The impulse to survey the activities of the year just ended, then, is a natural and necessary one. The mistake made by most individuals is to conduct the survey from the purely personal point of view, and to measure progress and achievement in terms of custom and convention, or likes and dislikes, instead of in terms of inner spiritual awakening. The student of Theosophy seeks in all things to elevate his consciousness to the position of Soul, and to consider as progress only such thoughts and deeds as have been conducive to egoic growth and unfoldment.

What, for example, has been the measure of achievement during the year just ended, in true morality? Where stands the inner im-

mortal man on the path of moral and spiritual evolution? For evaluation of this kind, one is required, no doubt, to look back over, not only the year, or even a lifetime, but back, and still farther back, into the historic and prehistoric past. He should attempt to discover, if possible, what the Reincarnating Ego has been doing during its many lifetimes upon earth that has led a Master of Wisdom to say that "human nature in general has not changed in a million years."

One reason why men fail in their resolves, perhaps, is their fear of public opinion, of what family, friends, and acquaintances may say if they adopt a code of life different from that of the masses. Few possess the courage to "come out and be separate," as admonished by Jesus. Yet, how can the individual who is afraid, who loves the crowd, and finds joy in the "company of men," pursue a course of action directed from within? David Riesman, the Yale University sociologist, makes it clear in *The Lonely Crowd* that men who strive only to be "just like everyone else," who invariably follow the standards and subscribe to the opinions of those around them, while they may become "adjusted" to the prevailing norm, actually become "maladjusted" to their own ideals and aspirations. The man who belongs to the crowd, and in no sense to himself, fails in his resolutions, because he is alienated from the inward thrusts of creative endeavor and independent thinking. Riesman refers to those whose conduct is fashioned after the desire to comply with accepted standards as "other-directed" men. In a concluding paragraph of *The Lonely Crowd,* he says:

> If the other-directed people should discover how much needless work they do, discover that their own thoughts and their own lives are quite as interesting as other people's, that, indeed, they can no more assuage their loneliness in a crowd than one can assuage one's thirst by drinking sea water, then we might expect them to become more attentive to their own feelings and aspirations.

The feeling of emptiness which a growing number of people seem to experience in the present can hardly be filled by assimilation with the crowd, or by entertainment, or any other external means. It can be filled only through self-knowledge, through an understanding of universal Law, and the rediscovery of the thread of true devotion. It can be filled only by resolve and by original thinking. For there is an atmosphere that surrounds the mind given to original thinking, an atmosphere possessing power to germinate all high hopes and resolutions. As the warming rays of the sun reach deep within the

throbbing heart of earth and nourish the soil, fructifying growing things, so the atmosphere surrounding fundamental ideas possesses the power to ignite the latent potentialities of Soul.

Low resolves, possessing the power only of the personal man, must eventually fail—while those drawing sustenance from the inner, immortal Ego, have the whole of Nature as their ally. The advantage of rising internally to the position of soul and of making only such resolutions as serve to further the moral and spiritual evolution of mankind, is that one thereby puts himself *en rapport* with Nature's universal plan and purpose. H. P. Blavatsky once wrote:

> Let no one imagine that it is a mere fancy, the attaching of importance to the birth of the year. The earth passes through its phases and man with it; and as a day can be colored so can a year. The astral light of the earth is young and strong between Christmas and Easter. Those who form their wishes now will have added strength to fulfil them consistently.

Once the individual grasps the grand Theosophical teaching that man is a god incarnate, a pillar of light, knowledge and power, encased in a physical frame; once he undertakes to think and act upon this basis, his inner nature, which heretofore has been dormant and constricted, begins to open up and make possible the influx of spiritual force. The nature of his resolves then becomes more universal and unselfish and his power to fulfill them will be intensified a hundredfold.

Resolutions are promises which men make to themselves. And with the ancients the keeping of promises was the highest form of duty—an honor equal in value almost to that of life itself. If people of today generally understood the meaning and sacredness of promises, pledges, oaths, vows and resolutions, and the karmic retribution they incur upon default, they would undoubtedly think twice before rashly "giving their word." Here, from H.P.B. again:

> We sincerely believe that the better portion of humanity will ever bear in mind that there exists a moral code of honor far more binding than an oath whether on the *Bible, Koran,* or *Veda.* The Essenes never swore on anything at all, but their "ayes" and "nays" were as good and far better than an oath. . . . Oaths will never be binding until each man will fully understand that humanity is the highest manifestation on earth of the Unseen Supreme Deity, and each man an incarnation of his God; and when the sense of personal responsibility will be so de-

veloped in him that he will consider foreswearing the greatest possible insult to himself as well as to humanity. No oath is now binding unless taken by one who without any oath at all would solemnly keep his simple promise of honor.

January 4-5 is held by the Founders of the Theosophical Movement to be the "Occult New Year." It is that point in the earth's cosmic relationship which marks the cycle, correspondentially, when the *Kumaras* (self-shining Monads) incarnated into the mindless human forms which Nature constructed over billions of years. It was this event—the "lighting-up of *Manas,*" in theosophical parlance—that constituted Humanity (or man on earth as he is today); and it is with the spiritual evolution, or the unfoldment, of this inner immortal man that aspiring individuals should be concerned. How have we, as Egos, spent the past million years, that our natures have not changed during that time? What have been our interests, aspirations, and resolves? Have we been dedicated during these many lifetimes of effort to objects of enduring value, or have we been chasing will-o'-the-wisps? Some individuals may contend that it is not possible to know what the stream of a lifetime meditation might have been in the last incarnation, to say nothing of a dozen or a hundred lifetimes ago. But if it is true, as stated in *The Secret Doctrine,* that "the present is the child of the past" and "thus are the past, the present, and the future, the ever-living trinity in one," then why may one not, by scrutinizing the present, gain at least a glimmer of insight into past and future lives? Present man, in both his inner and outer being—in his character, disposition, aspirations, hopes, and ideals; in his strength and weakness—is but a reflection, in time and space, of his total immortal Self. If the present is filled with doubt, despondency, and indifference, is this not indicative, perhaps, of an undisciplined personal life in the past? If, on the other hand, one finds in his heart and mind elements of hope and aspiration, why should he not assume that such was the nature of his old resolve, and that he is now, in this life, only picking up the threads of the ancient pledge?

What happens when a person makes a promise or a resolution? Is he the same carefree individual he was before, or has he thereby incurred a debt? Is one at liberty to break a pledge at will, or to disavow a trust at the first slight sign of personal gall or inconvenience? When one makes a promise or a vow, whether in the form of a note to the bank, of a simple confidence between friends, or of a sacred

pledge to one's chosen guru or to his Higher Self, he then and there, by the covenant mutually accepted, receives something *in advance* —however intangible that something may be. The promiser places himself under bondage or trust, a commitment from which he can never be relieved until the obligation is fulfilled. Have any of us been so foolish as to suppose that only those contracts and agreements that are secured by legal stipulation or by collateral are binding? When a person makes a promise or resolve, especially at the seed-time of Nature, he thereby imprints his picture, as it were, upon the sensitized canvas of divine *Akasa*—and, though this is no written contract signed by physical hand, it is nevertheless binding. And for this living signature of himself, the person receives a loan of spiritual power! The boon accepted, the obligation must be fulfilled—and no one in whom the sacred fire of *Manas* has been lit can with impunity disavow the trust. Is it any wonder that William Q. Judge has said, "The promises I made to myself are just as binding as any others"?

Every human being, according to Theosophical teaching, possesses an almost unlimited potentiality. Set aflame by the magic power of Will, these hidden potentialities may be made to come alive and yield to man his highest hopes and aspirations. How else, except through exercise of Will, have any of the high achievements of the past been effected? Unconsciously to himself, man calls upon his Will and draws upon the potentialities of Soul each and every day of his life—otherwise little of value could be achieved. But as powerful, self-conscious Kumaras, as gods incarnated in human forms, the men of the fifth race should do more than simply suffer these powers to operate. The man of awakened Manas should harness his Will and bring all lesser powers under conscious control. By the purification of desire and the dedication of one's life to the service of the Self, a man may discover the means of reaching his highest and most cherished dreams. For "the human Will," says William Q. Judge, "is all-powerful."

letters • questions • comment

NOT *alone Theosophists but many other "reincarnationists" wonder why the philosophy of rebirth does not count a majority instead of a minority of adherents. Schopenhauer has been quoted to the effect that reincarnation "presents itself as a natural conviction of a man whenever he reflects at all in an unprejudiced manner." But what are the sources of those prejudices which so often prevent the teaching of rebirth from finding "natural" acceptance?*

Attempts to answer this question by reference to the history of religions are interesting and informative, but insufficient—and this is particularly true today when, throughout every branch of Christendom, people are increasingly inclined to believe what they choose and to give only lip service to the orthodox formulations of their theological denominations. It also must be noted that in the Eastern world, while the doctrine of rebirth has never been "damned," as was the case with the anathemas proclaimed against the early Christian Father, Origen, the conceptions of rebirth characteristic of exoteric Hinduism and Buddhism are less than Theosophical. Those Buddhists whose wish to attain Buddhahood or *arhatship* is usually mixed with desire for a kind of sublime extinction in Nirvana are the parallel of the Christians who wish to end the agonies of living and learning by ascension to heaven. It should be clear, then, that there is a deep-seated psychological tendency in human beings of whatever cult to escape the implications of "endless evolution" as portrayed in formulation of reincarnation as eternal.

As H.P.B. suggests in *The Key to Theosophy,* the essential clue to the rejection of Theosophical philosophy of rebirth lies in failure to distinguish between individuality and personality—and in a manifest unwillingness to "let go" of attachment to the present personality, save, possibly, by a miraculous transcendence of *all* limitations. True reincarnation is a kind of "gradualism" of soul evolution, and demands that one forego the wishful thinking which either falsely exalts virtues of the present personality or looks to a sudden release

into perfection by way of Nirvana or Heaven. The mechanist is more obviously unable to separate his conception of egoity from the bundle of idiosyncracies which constitute present personality.

H. P. Blavatsky, in the section of the *Key* titled "Individuality and Personality," remarks that "the real Individuality is held responsible for all the sins committed through, and in, every new body or personality—the evanescent masks which hide the true Individual through the long series of rebirths." Madame Blavatsky then quotes approvingly a passage from Col. Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism*—a book wherein Olcott, assisted by H.P.B.'s teachings, endeavored to demonstrate that the "secret doctrine" of the Buddha had been buried by religious oversimplification and needed rediscovery. The crux, Olcott saw, is the recognition of a true, continuing, and distinct individuality—not to be confused with the present personality or any conceivable succession of personalities. Col. Olcott wrote:

> The successive appearances upon the earth, or "descents into generation," of the *tanhaically* coherent parts (Skandhas) of a certain being, are a succession of personalities. In each birth the PERSONALITY differs from that of a previous or next succeeding birth. Karma, the DEUS EX MACHINA, masks (or shall we say reflects?) itself now in the personality of a sage, again as an artisan, and so on throughout the string of births. But though personalities ever shift, the one line of life along which they are strung, like beads, runs unbroken; it is ever that *particular line,* never any other. It is therefore individual, an individual vital undulation, which began in Nirvana, or the subjective side of nature, as the light or heat undulation through æther began at its dynamic source; is careering through the objective side of nature under the impulse of Karma and the creative direction of *Tanha* (the unsatisfied desire for existence); and leads through many cyclic changes. . . .

Acceptance of the idea of reincarnation becomes philosophically mature only when a clear distinction is drawn between individuality and personality—not simply in theory but by psychological realization as well. Yet it is precisely this voluntary separation of one's self from cherished illusions and prejudices which is so hard to achieve—and this, too, is the reason why Arjuna, in the colloquy called *The Bhagavad-Gita,* is the symbol of every man. It is also the reason why there was an inevitable clash between the Spiritualists of the nineteenth century and the students of the "secret doctrine" of H. P. Blavatsky. The Spiritualists, who were ready enough to believe in "another world" where some kind of further development could take place, demanded that the present personality be pre-

served intact. In Spiritualist theory, one did not have to die to be reborn, did not have to face the work of creative striving again and again in successive lives, but could feel permanently secure within the confines of the present *persona.*

H.P.B.'s many references to the "secret doctrine" of Buddhism intimates that a complete and correct philosophy of reincarnation lies behind the great Buddhist tradition. Among intuitive travelers and writers who have sensed the presence of this teaching correctly is Lafcadio Hearn. In a chapter of *Gleanings in Buddha Fields,* titled "Nirvana," Hearn develops the distinction between individuality and personality. After correcting the erroneous impression "that Nirvana signifies, to Buddhist minds, neither more nor less than absolute nothingness,—complete annihilation," Hearn explains: "It is erroneous only because it contains half of a truth. This half of a truth has no value or interest, or even intelligibility, unless joined with the other half. And of the other half no suspicion yet exists in the average Western mind." Hearn then penetrates the obscurantism usually surrounding definitions of individuality, as compound by minds of typically religious bent:

> Nirvana, indeed, signifies an extinction. But if by this extinction of individual being we understand soul-death, our conception of Nirvana is wrong. Or if we take Nirvana to mean such reabsorption of the finite into the infinite as that predicted by Indian pantheism, again our idea is foreign to Buddhism.
>
> Nevertheless, if we declare that Nirvana means the extinction of individual sensation, emotion, thought,—the final disintegration of conscious personality,—the annihilation of everything that can be included under the term "I,"—then we rightly express one side of the Buddhist teaching. . . . We find a doctrine of rebirth; but the existence of a soul is denied. We are told that the misfortunes of this life are punishments of faults committed in a previous life; yet personal transmigration does not take place. We find the statement that beings are reindividualized; yet both individuality and personality are called illusions. I doubt whether anybody not acquainted with the deeper forms of Buddhist belief could possibly understand. . . .

The establishment of a valid distinction between individuality and personality is today being assisted by a growing number of psychologists and philosophers—both "Eastern" and "Western" (cf. Lookout for August, 1962, p. 472-7). In this area of inquiry, the most lucid separation of the *persona* from the true Ego is provided by C. J. Ducasse's distinguished work, *Nature, Mind, and Death.* In the concluding chapter of that volume, while treating of "Some

Possible Forms of Survival," Dr. Ducasse first indicates the necessity for reasoning closely as to what it is that may survive the death of the physical organism. He writes:

> In what a human being is at a given time we may distinguish two parts, one deeper and more permanent, and an other more superficial and transient. The latter consists of everything he has acquired since birth: habits, skills, memories, and so on. This is his personality. The other part, which, somewhat arbitrarily for lack of a better name we may here agree to call his individuality, comprises the aptitudes and dispositions which are native in him.

Dr. Ducasse continues:

> There can be no doubt that each of us, on the basis of his same individuality—that is, of his same stock of innate latent capacities and incapacities—would have developed a more or less different empirical mind and personality if, for instance, he had been put at birth in a different family, or had later been thrust by some external accident into a radically different sort of environment, or had had a different kind of education, or had met and married a very different type of person, and so on. Reflection on this fact should cause one to take his present personality with a large grain of salt, viewing it no longer humorlessly as his absolute self, but rather, in imaginative perspective, as but one of the various personalities which his individuality was equally capable of generating had it happened to enter phenomenal history through birth in a different environment. Thus, to the question: What is it that could be supposed to be reborn? an intelligible answer may be returned by saying that it might be the core of positive and negative aptitudes and tendencies which we have called a man's individuality, as distinguished from his personality. And the fact might further be that, perhaps as a result of persistent striving to acquire a skill or trait he desires, but for which he now has but little gift, aptitude for it in future births would be generated and incorporated into his individuality.

It is a tendency innately egotistic which wishes to deny the possibility that much of our present personality is caused by our bodily contacts with the environment into which we were born and by our mental contacts with those persons whom we meet and the literature to which we are exposed. It is the nature of the personality, as Krishna tells Arjuna, to refuse to give an inch, so to speak, and the humility which breaks through this part of the egocentric predicament is the necessary and truly philosophical humility. It seems to be demonstrable that young children have little difficulty in conceiving the philosophical doctrine of rebirth. May this not be because their "personalities" have not yet been formed, so that the higher mind has not been enmeshed in false identification?

PROEM

IX

[All contemporary Theosophical writing might be considered, from one standpoint, an introduction to the works of H. P. Blavatsky. As familiarity with the broad outlines of his work proceeds, each student discovers, further, the need for contemplative attention to those metaphysics she termed an "essential part of the Secret Doctrine." The "Proem" to the book of that title (*The Secret Doctrine*) involves much of the abstract and abstruse. Articles appearing under the title "Proem" represent one avenue of explorations.—Eds. THEOSOPHY]

INTELLIGENCE is as difficult of definition as Life itself, or as Time. Definition is intended for clarification. It may prevent confusion, but it may also limit the lines of inquiry, as when something named is regarded as something known, or when terms have a profound metaphysical meaning, such as Intelligence, Life, and Time.

Wherever there is movement—that is, *Motion*—these three are inseparably involved: some aspect of Mind, some state of Consciousness, and some period of Duration, which may be infinitely small, or vast as the "Seven Eternities" of the opening verse of Stanza I of the Book of Dzyan.

The First Stanza refers to the Pralaya of the Universe—the *Night* of Brahma—the abstract state of "boundlessness," when—

> TIME was not, for it lay asleep in the infinite bosom of Duration.
>
> Universal MIND was not, for there were no Ah-hi to contain it. . . .
>
> and
>
> LIFE pulsated unconscious in Universal Space.

What is the key to the understanding of the mysterious verses of the First Stanza? Or, should we ask ourselves, What *was?* In the answer to this question is the sure and only key—essential Unity. In the words of the First Fundamental Proposition of *The Secret Doctrine,* it is "Be-ness" under its two philosophically conceivable aspects of "absolute abstract Motion" and "absolute abstract Space."

Correspondentially and logically, during the Manvantaric phase of the Universe—the *Day* of Brahma—the secret of understanding

is in the realization of that essential Unity: the mysteries of Life, the paradoxes and problems of living, the anomalies in nature and in human nature are "knowable" in the light of that indivisible UNITY. How could one speak of an "aspect" of mind, a "degree" of intelligence, a "state" of consciousness, a "moment" or "cycle" of time, except for the implied *unity* in each respective phrase, and the sensed *unity in variety* as a Whole? Indissoluble Unity—*unbroken,* whether the Universe is in-or-out of manifestation.

In attempting to rationalize *separatively* the initial "conditioning" of Consciousness, the primal "manifestation" of Mind, the ultimate "division" of Time, anthropomorphic deities are born or sustained; the perceptions are clouded and the concepts confused, and man becomes the helpless creature, or victim, of his own power to think, to create. The counsel of Robert Crosbie in one of his early letters in *The Friendly Philosopher* is pertinent here:

> May I add one word to you, as a friend and brother: make clean and clear, first, the mental conceptions and perceptions; the rest *will follow naturally;* there will be no destruction—the undesirable will die a natural death. "Grow as the flowers grow," from within outwards. (p. 8)

"Time," says *The Secret Doctrine,* "is only an illusion produced by the succession of our states of consciousness as we travel through eternal duration" (I, 37). Time as we know it, being continuous, is a binding element uniting Past, Present, and Future. Time is also a bounding factor, marking the beginning and ending of any manifestation, and defining the cyclic changes in experience that intervene. The story-teller begins the magic tale with "Once upon a time" and the mind is drawn to a focus, for a "beginning" in Time. With the closing words, "and they lived happily ever after," the woven spell is broken, the story "ends," but the sense of continuity in Time remains. If the tale is tragic, the consequences that unfold do not end with the telling of the tale.

In Cosmogenesis, Time has a dynamic character. The first page of the Proem to *The Secret Doctrine* is filled with expectation. The Point-symbol foretokens the *Day* of Brahma—the great Cycle-to-be of manifesting Life through evolutionary progress, the unfoldment of latent potentialities. The symbol of "the Point in the Mundane Egg" represents "the germ which will become the Universe, the

ALL, the boundless, periodical Kosmos, this germ being latent and active, periodically and by turns."

What is a "germ"? Figuratively, it is the primary source of anything; that from which a thing may be developed as from a seed. Actually, a germ is a "rudimentary vital element." In the present context, *element* is the essential root, the irreducible basis or character or quality of any form of manifestation. *Rudiment* is that which is undeveloped—an "unfinished beginning," according to the dictionary. And "in Occultism":

> The word *Element* means "rudiment" in every case. When we say "Elementary Man," we mean either the proemial, incipient sketch of man, in its unfinished and undeveloped condition, hence in that form which now lies latent in physical man during his life-time. . . . With regard to "Element," when the term is used metaphysically, it means, in distinction to the mortal, the incipient *divine* man; and, in its physical usage, inchoate matter in its first undifferentiated condition, or in the laya state . . . (*S.D.* I, 567).

The word *vital* (Latin *vita,* life) applies to a *manifestation* of Life —a power, force, energy, or *motion* animating and sustaining every form, visible or invisible. Its connotations are: pertaining to life, existent as a manifestation of life, necessary to the continuance of life. William Q. Judge says, in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* "Life sustains all the forms requiring life. . . ." He adds:

> Life is a universally pervasive principle. It is the ocean in which the earth floats; it permeates the globe and every being and object on it. It works unceasingly on and around us forever. When we occupy a body we merely use a more specialized instrument than any other for dealing with *Prana* and *Jiva* (Life Energy). Strictly speaking, *Prana* is breath; and as breath is necessary for the continuance of life in the human machine, that is the better word. *Jiva* means "life," and also is applied to the living soul, for the soul in general is derived from the Supreme Life itself.

The *idea* of a "Universe of Life" is suggested by the title of Mr. Judge's book. The imagery of "Ocean" suggests the boundless, also both shallow waters and undeterminable depths, the unceasing rhythms and interpenetrating movements, the playful sports of recreation and "high adventure," and finally the *other shore* to be reached by the undaunted soul whose goal is Self-knowledge.

The book opens with a definition: "Theosophy is that ocean of knowledge which spreads from shore to shore of the evolution of sentient beings. . . ." And *Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms* (9, Book II)

widens the horizon of meaning here implied: "The tenacious wish for existence upon earth is inherent in all sentient beings, and continues through all incarnations, because it has self-reproductive power. It is felt as well by the wise as the unwise." Mr. Judge's note on the Aphorism gives it "Manvantaric" scope:

> There is in the spirit a natural tendency, throughout a Manvantara, to manifestation on the material plane, on and through which only, the spiritual monads can attain their development; and this tendency, acting through the physical basis common to all sentient beings, is extremely powerful and continues through all incarnations, helping to cause them, in fact, and re-producing itself in each incarnation.

Intelligence is Creative, Preservative, and Destructive—since all regeneration or re-creation is necessarily preceded by destruction. Intelligence is Individual, Collective, and Hierarchical. The sum total of Intelligences is the Universal Mind, therefore every definition of intelligence is limiting. According to the dictionary: Intelligence is (*a*) formerly, the faculty of understanding; the capacity to know or apprehend; the intellect as a gift or an endowment—in which sense it commonly designates a concrete or embodied intellect. Its meaning may cover any power of apprehension or be loosely equivalent to *mind*. (*b*) The capacity for knowledge and understanding, especially as applied to the handling of novel situations; the power of meeting a novel situation successfully by adjusting one's behavior to the total situation; the ability to apprehend the interrelationships of presented facts in such a way as to guide action towards a desired goal. Psychologists still debate the question whether intelligence is a unitary characteristic of the individual or a sum of his abilities to deal with various types of situation.

According to *The Secret Doctrine*:

> There is but one indivisible and absolute Omniscience and Intelligence in the Universe, and this thrills throughout every atom and infinitesimal point of the whole finite Kosmos which hath no bounds, and which people call SPACE, considered independently of anything contained in it.
>
> . . . The very *fact* that adaptations *do* occur, that the fittest *do* survive in the struggle for existence, shows that what is called "unconscious Nature" is in reality an aggregate of forces manipulated by semi-intelligent beings (Elementals) guided by High Planetary Spirits (Dhyan Chohans), whose collective aggregate forms the manifested *verbum* of the unmanifested LOGOS, and constitutes at one and the same time the MIND of the Universe and its immutable LAW.

YOUTH FORUM

MEMORABILITY

THROUGHOUT the history of Western civilization, and in epic literature from its beginning, efforts have been made to render the life of men or the occurrences of dramatic events "memorable." From the Theosophical point of view, what are the psychological roots of this seeking for "memorability"?

"A funeral hush, a speechless grief so froze all hearts that they were too dismayed to think what they should leave behind or carry with them. Now they would stand at their stoops asking one another's advice, now they would roam aimlessly through their houses for a last look." A last look, a stabbing desire to fix in the memory for all time an image of the beloved object—such is Livy's account of the way the inhabitants of Alba Longa reacted when their city was about to be razed to the ground by the Romans, in the seventh century BC. But where is the memory now—now when both homes and inhabitants are lost in the dust of millenniums? Who is there now to mourn for Alba Longa?

Once this initial question is asked, a dozen others claim attention, all clustering about the central tragedy of forgetting. Why *should* the city be mourned? Is there something intrinsically more memorable about one object or event than another? Is anything worthy of memory? Is anything *not* worthy of memory? And, perhaps most important of all, in what way may all these memories be preserved?

Of the seven planes of consciousness which, according to the Teachings, range from the physical to the spiritual, the astral plane (the one just above the physical) is described much as though it were a photographic plate. This plane is intimately connected with the physical, for it is its invisible counterpart, its pattern, and so is impressed with the images of all physical objects and events. In a purely automatic way, then, the astral plane retains the invisible structure of every externality. Further, the physical world is in a

deep sense not just remembered, but memorable as well (that is, *worthy* of memory); for it is an expression of Spirit, a metaphor of the divine, the Word made flesh.

The ancient Greeks felt that a man's fame lives after him in his glorious deeds, celebrated by the songs and poetry of succeeding generations. In a way, of course, this is true; literature does convey to posterity the deeds and way of life of previous times—would we know anything at all about Alba Longa, had it not been for men such as Livy? Yet in another sense, the lasting value of a man's life should not be dependent upon recognition by other men. If it were, the deeds of all the unsung heroes would carry no moral significance for present-day humanity. However, if we assume that man is a sevenfold being engaged in an infinite pilgrimage, we may find it difficult to believe that anything is ever really lost. The pure distillation of all our memories is with us all the time, in the form of character.

Homer's *Iliad* seems to hint quite clearly that the poems and songs of posterity, though important, do not represent the only way that a man's unending glory may be assured. Each god, each man, and each creature below man has its own *moira,* or destiny. Above and below man there is peace: both gods and animals fulfill themselves instinctively, without effort. It is only man who must strive to fulfill his destiny, to consciously stretch himself painfully out to his full potential, thus defining his own natural limits—like a ripe fruit stretching taut its skin. It is only when man is striving for perfection "like something more than a man"—or as Rilke put it, when he is "a resonant glass that shatters while it is ringing"—only then is man truly fulfilling himself; only then does he achieve true memorability; only then does he mediate and resonate between the gods and the brutes, between Spirit and Matter—like the middle note of a triad. A lyre string must be stretched quite tight before it will give a pure tone. But once this tension is achieved, and a man does sense his participation in the universal harmony, he will (if we are to believe Homer) be suddenly inspired with awe. And it is through this sense of wonder that the *unforgettability* of man can be attained. Throughout the *Iliad,* Homer evokes this sense of wonder by comparing the "human" with the "divine," the transient with the everlasting, the grinding clash of war with the thunderous silence of a snowstorm—as though just behind the noise of human strife lay the hush of a universal peace, a permanent cosmic order.

on the lookout

"The Agony of the Church"

A *Christian Century* editorial (Oct. 10) with this heading sets the question of civil rights in the South squarely within the framework of Christ's teachings and issues a strong indictment against the "white Christian church." The editorial writer begins with a bit of "history":

> Eighteen years ago Gunner Myrdal and a group of collaborators wrote *An American Dilemma,* a study of the race problem in a modern democracy. This book was immediately recognized as the definitive study of the Negro-white struggle in the United States. The brilliant Swedish author rightly located the battleground of the struggle: the soul of the nation. More than any other book *An American Dilemma* helped produce the 1954 Supreme Court decision declaring segregated public schools unconstitutional. Significantly, it urged the nation to resolve its dilemma.
>
> The title of the Myrdal volume refers to the clashing of precept and practice in a democracy dedicated to ideals of human dignity and equality yet guilty of widespread discriminatory practices directed at the Negro and other minority groups. The dilemma created by the contradiction between American dream and American deed results in a split national personality.

The Guilt not Regional

The editorial continues:

> A much more tormenting struggle is now taking place within the soul of the white Christian church. What is merely a dilemma for the nation is an agony for the church. This is so because in the church the principles of human dignity and equality are accepted not merely as humanitarian ideals to strive for but as divine imperatives which God commands his children to obey. Yet it is in the white church that these commands, so far as the Negro is concerned, are most flagrantly disobeyed.
>
> This is no sectional guilt or regional agony. There are white Christian churches in northern and western states which have no Negro members though Negroes live in their neighborhoods. . . . Again some churches remain exclusively white because they are planted in the heart of exclusively white neighborhoods and take

no steps to promote open occupancy. Whatever the leadership of such churches may *say* about their willingness to accept all people irrespective of color, that willingness can never be tested so long as the church members and their friends hold to a one-race neighborhood policy.

How to Resolve the "Agony"?

The *Century* editorial does not equivocate. It brings the church, nationwide, to the bar for judgment. The church, it says, "loves the cruel falsehood of racial exclusiveness more than it loves Christ." Noting that "the one thing a white minister in the south—and in most of the north—must not talk about if he wants to be popular, prosperous and secure is race," the editorial concludes:

> The racial struggle would put a dilemma for the church even if she had no conscience about the equal rights of the Negro as a child of God. Even for the most rigid racist in her fellowship, the clash between truth and prejudice is at least an annoyance. But the dilemma turns into an agony in the hearts of Christians who have a conscience about the way the white church treats the Negro. . . . It will be a tragic day for the Christian church if anything other than repentant obedience to the will of Jesus Christ takes away that agony.

A Timely Question

The *Nation* for Oct. 13, featuring an article by the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. on the "stark tragedy" of the Mississippi crisis, sounds the same note. Dr. King asks of the church:

> Where was the cry of the Lord's prophets? The most serious indictment is not to be made against a screaming mob propelled by bottled-up venom and hatred that was having its ultimate, tragic catharsis. Surely the abysmal silence of the church and the clergy cannot pass without its due reckoning. The New Testament admonishes us that the people cannot hear if the trumpet makes an uncertain sound. What is their hope if the trumpet makes no sound at all? I have traveled much of the length and breadth of Mississippi. I've seen tall church spires and sprawling brick monuments dedicated to the glory of God. Often did I wonder, "What kind of people worship there? Who is their God?" When I review the painful memory of the last week at Oxford and cannot recall a single voice "crying in the wilderness," the questions are still the same: "What kind of people worship there? Who is their God?"

A Theosophical Viewpoint

In an article printed in a New York weekly in 1891 (reprinted in THEOSOPHY 35:437), Mr. Judge discusses "Religion and Reform from a Theosophical View-Point." He expresses the belief that the religions of the Occident are inadequate for effecting social reforms:

The theosophist can see no possibility of reform in existing abuses, in politics or social relations, unless the plan of reform is one which grows out of a true religion, and he does not think that any of the prevailing religions of the Occident are true or adequate. They do not go to the root of the evil which causes the pain and sorrow that call for reform or alleviation. And in his opinion theosophy—the essence or concentrated virtue of every religion—alone has power to offer and effect the cure. . . .

The two great laws postulated by Theosophy for the world's reform are those of Karma and Reincarnation. . . . Without such Theosophic philosophy and religion, the constantly increasing concessions made to the clamor of the uneducated democracy's demands will only end in inflating the actual majority with an undue sense of their real power, and thus precipitate the convulsion which might be averted by the other course.

Reaching for Further Dilemmas?

A column in the Oct. 15 New York *Times* (western edition) poses an "abstract issue" which may be presented to the Roman church as man's explorations extend further and further into space. C. L. Sulzberger notes that in its doctrinal stand "the Church has never drawn distinctions between the types of humanity eligible for its solace." That numerous African and Asian bishops are attending the current ecumenical council shows clearly that "the Church regards external appearances of the human body as unimportant to the eligibility of the soul it contains." Mr. Sulzberger wonders:

What would be the attitude towards intellectual creatures, able to think and communicate understandably and some day reachable by this planet's inhabitants—at least, by radio exchanges; creatures who bear no physical resemblance to what we know as man?

Would soul animating a body resembling a jellyfish be considered human in the psychological sense? In such a case would it be free of original sin by Catholic dogma? Could it be doctrinally determined whether such "people" had ever been visited by Christ?

Compounding the Enigma

The *Times* writer continues:

Would it be necessary, indeed, that such "beings" possessed physical bodies? Or might there not be some species of psychic actuality without perceptible substance? In that event, how would these differ from angels which, in theological terms, are pure, spirit without matter?

This Council will surely limit itself to the more modest if vital task of reaffirming its credo that any earthly being considered human and

thereby possessing a soul is potentially the religious equal of all its terrestrial fellows. By stressing equality of the bodies containing souls, it emphasizes an ancient stand against racism. . . . [But] by punctuating its approaches on race theology, the church immutably moves toward space theology.

A Conversation on Hypnotism

Further evidence that responsible psychiatrists and psychoanalysts are mindful of Freud's warnings regarding the dangers of relying upon hypnotism during therapy is provided by Dr. Beulah Parker in *My Language Is Me*. This book is a detailed account of six years of therapy with a disturbed adolescent (Basic Books, 1962). On one occasion the patient reveals that he has been to see a hypnotist and may seek his services. The youth tells his therapist:

"I went to New York this week to see a hypnotist. I'd read an ad saying that he could break blocks to learning that exist in the unconscious mind. I asked if he thought he could bring out the combinations for the puzzle contest that I'm sure are in my mind if I could only get at them quickly enough. He said he pretty surely could."

(We have a long discussion of hypnotism, in which I urge him not to play around with it. He asks the dangers.) [I continued]: "I feel there are good reasons why it is difficult for you to uncover all your unconscious feelings and emotions speedily, and that you would do better to take them at the pace for which you yourself feel ready, not have them dragged out of you by force. It is a great temptation for you to be passive and have things 'done to' you, as we discussed last time, but you also have a strong need to defend yourself against the possibility of exploitation. I think you will do well to trust yourself to people who know you well, and whom you know well enough yourself so that you're willing to risk *voluntary* revelations at such a pace, and under such conditions, that you feel safe. Although under scientific conditions hypnotism is useful, it can also be abused. Someone who puts ads in the paper guaranteeing miraculous discoveries might not be a very responsible person. In spite of the temptation to passivity, you should keep yourself in the position of being an active, voluntary agent in whatever therapeutic process you are involved in."

"That makes sense," he said.

Another Warning against Hypnosis

In an article, "The Interpersonal Relationship in Hypnosis" (*Psychiatry,* August), Dr. Rudolf Dreikurs, an associate and collaborator of Alfred Adler, discusses "some fallacies in current thinking about hypnosis," arriving at the following conclusion:

Hypnosis will not continue as a therapeutic procedure, despite its present tremendous appeal and increasingly wide use. It does not fit

into a democratic atmosphere which emphasizes and requires self-determination and self-respect. Both these necessary attributes of free man are endangered, and the development of a more adequate, new concept of man is obstructed by the wide and indiscriminate use of hypnosis. Careful studies are urgently needed of the effects of hypnosis on the personality make-up of the subject. It is known that an increased suggestibility facilitates the induction of hypnosis. It is possible, even probable, that hypnosis in turn increases a subject's suggestibility, perhaps for life. One can visualize many detrimental effects which a higher level of suggestibility in the population might produce, such as poorer judgment, inability for self-determination, and a lowered sense of responsibility.

Hypnotic Procedures Out of Line with New Concept of Man

Dr. Dreikurs continues:

This is an era in which the autocratic structure of society is rapidly giving way to a new form of human relationships. The democratic evolution implies not only a political change but a social change as well. The traditional relationship of superiors and inferiors, of dominance and submission, is yielding to a form of relationship based on equality, mutual respect, freedom for each to determine his own course of action, and individual responsibility, with the willingness and ability to discharge it. . . .

This concept is very difficult for members of a frightened generation to comprehend and accept; they cannot believe in the tremendous strength and power which each individual possesses. Instead, they resign themselves to the impressive help which they can get from the outside. Instead of learning to take pain in their stride or perhaps even to avoid it through their own efforts and attitudes, they voluntarily abdicate their control.

Relationship of Hypnotist and Patient

The "mutually satisfying" relationship of power and dominance on the part of the hypnotist and submission and a feeling of security on the part of the patient is one that is likely to have harmful results on "mankind as a whole," Dr. Dreikurs believes. For example, speaking of the widely-advocated use of hypnosis in child-birth, he says:

There is a far-reaching and fundamental difference between putting women into a hypnotic trance and teaching them to go through labor with reduced pain by means of less struggling, resistance, and anxiety. Both approaches may have the same beneficial effect as far as pain is concerned; but one leaves the mother with a sense of her own accomplishment and with the feeling that she has learned something that is applicable to many other situations in life. The other may induce her and her friends who have heard about the beneficial effects of hypnosis

to seek the same kind of help in other situations which are unpleasant or painful. There can be no doubt that the hypnotic approach is simpler and quicker, but its after effects are dubious. . . . I would like to say that hypnosis has its well-deserved place for emergency situations, as a method of last resort . . . but the wider implications and consequences of an indiscriminate and routine use of hypnosis should be carefully considered.

Hypnotism—A Psychic Malpractice

It is clear that Dr. Dreikurs considers it almost impossible, if not entirely so, for the hypnotist to avoid being consciously or unconsciously swayed by personal motives in the patient-hypnotist relationship. This makes for a dangerous situation; it is too easy for one person to exploit and the other to be exploited. H. P. Blavatsky speaks on this phase of the subject in *Isis Unveiled* I, 217:

If a diseased person—medium or not—attempts to heal, his force may be sufficiently robust to displace the disease, to disturb it in the present place, and cause it to shift to another, where shortly it will appear; the patient, meanwhile, thinking himself cured.

But, what if the healer be morally diseased? The consequences may be infinitely more mischievous; for it is easier to cure a bodily disease than cleanse a constitution infected with moral turpitude. . . . If the gift of prophecy, as well as hysteria and convulsions, can be imparted by "infection," why not every vice? The healer, in such a case, conveys to his patient—who is now his victim—the moral poison that infects his own mind and heart. His magnetic touch is defilement; his glance, profanation. Against this insidious taint, there is no protection for the passively-receptive subject. The healer holds him under his power, spell-bound and powerless, as the serpent holds a poor, weak bird. The evil that one such "healing medium" can effect is incalculably great; and such healers there are by the hundred.

This, of course, makes the point much more strongly from an occult perspective. Yet the same basic assumptions and warnings are tacit in Dr. Dreikurs' article.

Buddhism in America

Time for Oct. 26 contains the following:

"While the Vatican Council in Rome is celebrating the eventual unity of all Christians, here in New York we are celebrating the essential unity of all man's religions," Unitarian Minister Donald Harrington told his congregation at Manhattan's Community Church last week. As Harrington completed his sermon a prayer gong sounded, and a red-robed priest began to chant the ancient Shishinrai: "We reverently pay homage to the Eternal Buddha. We reverently pay homage to the

Eternal Dharma. We reverently pay homage to the Eternal Sangha." The Twelve Adorations were chanted and the Eight Paths of Righteousness explained.

This service, the item notes, was the first to be held in a Christian church. Priests and scholars from Japan shared the platform with American Buddhist priests and Christian ministers. Although the majority of members of the Buddhist church are Japanese, American membership is increasing annually. *Time* concludes: "With the faddists mostly gone, a small group of serious Occidentals continue to find a unique serenity in Buddhism and often are the most active members of a congregation. There is no proselytizing and no dogmatic version of creation and salvation."

A British Canon on Reincarnation

A lecture delivered by Church of England's A. P. Shepherd, of Worcester, titled "Christ and the Modern Man," refers favorably to the philosophy of reincarnation. Dr. Shepherd was apparently introduced to the area of essential Eastern philosophy by Rudolf Steiner, one-time Theosophist and founder of Anthroposophy. Dr. Shepherd now feels that the perspective of reincarnation is of great psychological significance. He says:

> If we take into our unprejudiced thinking the picture of reincarnation as the process of human evolution, we shall find in it the answer to the problems of the new world situation.
>
> We shall find the working of the Unconscious explained at the first level of spiritual-physical, or etheric, being. Its many manifestations of mental abnormality will be seen to be due to an increasing un-self-conscious awareness of some etheric phenomena, without an understanding of the new conditions of consciousness and being that interpret them. It is a confusion of physical and etheric consciousness. This is a danger which Steiner declared forty years ago would meet man in his unconscious spiritual evolution in the second half of this century, unless he achieved awareness and understanding of spirit reality.
>
> So too, the vast picture of the meaningless masses and movements of the nebulae resolves itself into a universe of spirit beings, in infinite creative relationships to one another and to man. The perplexity of history, with its procession of rising and falling civilisations, is seen as mankind's pilgrimage of spiritual descent and ascent, in which we all have taken part, and in which recurring individual reincarnation is the principle of unification and progress. So too, the apparent inadequacy of a single earth life, or its bondage to physical or mental or moral or circumstantial deficiency, is given new hope and understanding in the realisation of the process of reincarnation.

The Jungle Boy from Ceylon

From time to time stories crop up of children who, having been brought up by wild animals, are, when found, chiefly animal-like and mentally retarded. The story of such a boy appears in the *Illustrated Weekly of India* for Dec. 31, 1961:

> Sumanasekera was found in Nuwara Eliya District when he was a child. The aged couple who first saw the naked boy in the jungle had considerable difficulty in capturing him, for he was more of an animal than a child at that time. Resisting the boy's bites and shouts the couple finally brought him out of the jungle and handed him over to one Appuhamy, of Bandarawela. According to reports, it was Appuhamy who named the boy Sumanasekera.
>
> In the village, too, Sumanasekera behaved more like an animal. He was quick to bite people, especially the village lads who teased him. He also liked to climb trees and live among cattle in the open fields. Sometimes he would drink milk from the cow's udders.

Permanent Mental Retardation

Complaints of the villagers resulted in the boy's being sent away. After many vicissitudes, he was eventually sent to the Sucharithadaya Social Centre (a large organization with a children's home, a home for the aged, and a weaving school) where the children nicknamed him Simbo. Here attempts were made to teach Simbo, whose age was estimated at approximately fifteen, some sort of trade, but—

> Specialists say that his mental age is that of a child of five years and that mentally he is not fit for any type of education. He cannot learn anything, but makes himself useful to the Centre as an errand-boy. Simbo's face, teeth, legs and fingers are all similar to those of a monkey. The first fingers of his hands are unusually long. When provoked, he jumps and bites like an animal. Drinking milk from cups and glasses does not come easily to him. Simbo is as agile as a simian in climbing trees. A fast runner, he prefers to take short cuts through the paddy fields and thickets rather than pass by the main roads.

Accounts of this sort seem to parallel the implications in the Theosophical teaching of the lighting up of Manas—that Manas *must* be "lighted up" by contact with another *mind,* and that if this is not done in infancy the damage is irreparable. This is implied by Mr. Judge in the *Ocean* (p. 53): "The manner in which this light of mind was given to the Mindless Men can be understood from the illustration of one candle lighting many. Given one lighted candle and numerous unlighted ones, it follows that from one light the others may also be set aflame."